

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of January 9, 2008, the specification was objected to because the abstract did not follow the suggested language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. In addition, claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,646,327 (hereinafter "Kojima et al."). Furthermore, claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA and Kojima et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,118,739 (hereinafter "Umehara").

With respect to the abstract of the disclosure, Applicant appreciates the suggestions made in the Office Action. However, since these suggestions are not mandatory, Applicant respectfully declines to amend the current abstract. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

With respect to the claim rejections, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1 and 5 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. As amended, the independent claims 1 and 5 are not obvious in view of AAPA and Kojima et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of the amended independent claims 1 and 5, as well as the dependent claims 2-4 and 6-11.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 5

As amended, the independent claims 1 and 5 recite in part "*to generate an amplitude-modulated signal having only two amplitudes,*" which is not found in AAPA and Kojima et al. if combined in the manner suggested in the Office Action. Thus, the amended independent claims 1 and 5 are not obvious in view of AAPA and Kojima et al.

As stated on page 4, the Office Action has interpreted the combination of the waveform shaping apparatus 11 and the low-pass filter 13, which are shown in Fig. 2 of Kojima et al., as the claimed signal-edge influencing means. As illustrated in Figs. 3A-3F, the waveform shaping apparatus 11 processes input data and produces output signal, e.g., the output signal of Fig. 3F. As illustrated in Fig. 3F, the output signal may include more than two levels, e.g., levels -1, 0, 1, 2 and 3. Thus, if AAPA is modified to include the waveform shaping apparatus 11 and the low-pass filter 13 of Kojima et al., the resulting amplitude-modulated signal will not have “*only two amplitudes*,” as recited in the amended independent claims 1 and 5. Thus, the amended independent claims 1 and 5 are not obvious in view of AAPA and Kojima et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claims 1 and 5 be allowed.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-4 and 6-11

Each of the dependent claims 2-4 and 6-11 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 5. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ewald Bergler

Date: March 10, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300